DOCUMENT RÈSUME

ED 455 583 EA 031 140

AUTHOR	Bryant, Miles; Son, Jong Ho
TITLE	Proper Human Relationships: Korean [illegible]ncipals' Leadership Styles.
PUB DATE	2001-04-00
NOTE	28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Principles; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Exchange; Cultural Influences; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Leadership Styles
IDENTIFIERS	*South Korea

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to better understand the values that Korean educational administrators associate with leadership, researchers surveyed a random sample of 292 subjects in South Korea in the spring of 2000. Using several well-tested instruments, the researchers were able to report findings of relevance to scholars interested in cultural influences on perceptions of leadership. Data revealed a strong adherence to Confucian values. The analysis of data obtained using a Western-oriented leadership-style instrument proved more problematic as the instrument failed to discriminate well in this population of educational leaders. In Korea, proper human relationships meant sustaining social structures that govern relationships of superiors and subordinates. The school principals perceived traditional social structures as very important in how they perceived their role as formal institutional leaders. Attempts to graft Western leadership values onto Korean culture should be crafted with an understanding of this reality. Appendices include a copy of a modified questionnaire based on the Authoritarian Scale and Multifactor Leadership Scale, and a copy of the Chinese Value Survey both in English and in Korean. (Contains 23 references and 13 tables.) (Author/RT)

Proper Human Relationships: Korean Principals' Leadership Styles

ED 455 583

Dr. Miles Bryant

Dr. Jong Ho Son

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0558

Running Head: Proper Human Relationships

A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting,
Seattle, WA, April 9-14, 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Bryant
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 031140

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

In an attempt to better understand the values that Korean educational administrators associate with leadership, researchers surveyed a random sample of 292 subjects in South Korea in the spring of 2000. Using several well-tested instruments, the researchers were able to report findings of relevance to scholars interested in cultural influences on perceptions of leadership. Data revealed a strong adherence to Confucian values. The analysis of data obtained using a western oriented leadership style instrument proved more problematic as the instrument failed to discriminate well in this population of educational leaders. In Korea, proper human relationships meant sustaining social structures that govern relationships of superiors and subordinates. The school principals perceived traditional social structures as very important in how they perceived their role as formal institutional leaders. Attempts to graft western leadership values onto Korean culture should be crafted with an understanding of this reality.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to ascertain how school administrators in Korea perceived the main characteristics of leadership as manifested in their school cultures. Increasing number of educators from Korea have obtained graduate education degrees from institutions in American and Europe and Australia. Consequently, the authors reasoned that western conceptions of leadership were beginning to influence the leadership culture of Korea. An effort to describe the prevailing leadership values of Korean administrators promised to be a useful backdrop for this growing trend. Specifically, we were interested in gathering perceptions of Korean administrators about attitudes toward authoritative and democratic leadership styles and we wanted to know how strongly Korean principals perceived themselves as adhering to Confucian values.

Theoretical Framework

Increasingly, individuals from non-western countries study leadership and administration in western institutions. Consequently, the spread of western conceptions

of leadership into many different cultural settings occurs as these individuals return to their native countries. How these learned understandings of leadership become enacted in the non-western context, particularly in the field of education, is a matter of legitimate concern. Bass wrote that "given the continuing internationalization and observed cross-cultural differences.....how much is it possible to generalize the results of leadership research from one country to another?" (1990, p. 761). In the western context, generations of scholars have explored what are typically described as the two dimensions of leadership (White and Lippitt, 1960; Stogdill and Coons, 1957; Halpin and Winer, 1957; McGregor, 1960; Likert, 1967; Burns, 1978; Greenfield, 1978; Sergiovanni, Metzeus and Burden, 1969; Senge, 1990; Deming, 1986; Wheatley, 1994). The two dimensions are often labeled: initiating versus consideration (Shartle and Stogdill, 1953) or task orientation versus people orientation. Surveys and instruments designed to capture leadership in the organizational setting often utilize these two dimensions in the structure of the investigation.

We know, however, that there are significant cultural differences that impact leadership behavior and beliefs (Hofstede, 1991; Inkles, 1966; Mead, 1930, 1935; Bryant: 1998). These studies raise issues about the "export of ideas to people in other countries without regard for the values context in which these ideas were developed" (Hofstede, 1991:41). In many eastern countries, one of the dimensions of leadership that can be expected to surface centers about traditional Confucian values. Bond and Hwang (1985), for example, identified paternalism as a strong characteristic of leadership in East Asia. In turn, paternalism is compatible with the Confucian values of respect for authority, conformism, and deference. Such a set of Eastern values shapes beliefs about leadership that may not conform to those held in many Western societies. Yet, not infrequently, individuals who assume leadership positions in eastern nations come to those positions well informed with western understandings of leadership.

For example, in Korea a national system of education has been subject to western ideas as educators train in Australia, the United States, and Great Britain and then return to Korean schools. This study demonstrated that in spite of that exposure to western conceptions of leadership, Eastern values continue to shape how Korean educational leaders view their position and role.

The Study

The purpose of the study was to test the application of several widely accepted Western approaches to leadership analysis in a population of Korean school principals and to weigh the results from such instruments to one designed specifically for Eastern cultures. Our study was exploratory in that we intentionally used Western leadership instruments. We developed a modified questionnaire to capture perceptions of leadership styles by drawing items from the Authoritarian Scale (Sanford, 1950 and the Multifactor Leadership Scale (Bass and Avolio, 1990). A copy of that questionnaire is attached as Appendix A and contained items that assessed perceptions about autocratic and democratic leadership values. We also wished to determine the influence of Confucian values on the leadership perspective of Korean principals and used the Chinese Value Survey (the Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) to capture adherence to Confucian values. This instrument is attached as Appendix B.

Research Questions

The following five questions formed the basis for this study.

1. To what degree do Korean principals subscribe to Confucian beliefs as measured by the Confucian Value Survey (CVS)?
2. Do Korean principals report adhering to an authoritative leadership style as measured by the modified Authoritarian and Multifactor Leadership Scales?
3. Do Korean principals report adhering to a democratic leadership style as measured by the Authoritarian and Multifactor Leadership Scales?
4. Is there a relationship between principal's beliefs about Confucian values and their beliefs about authoritarian leadership?
5. Is there a relationship between principal's beliefs about Confucian values and their beliefs about democratic leadership?

De-limitations and Limitations

This study was limited to the perceptions on leadership gained through a mailed survey of secondary school principals in South Korea. Among the limitations of the study are the following points.

1) The subjects of this study were non-English speaking Korean principals. The surveys were translated from English into Korean and then translated back into English. Thus, as is always the case with translation, errors in meaning and interpretation could readily impact construct validity.
2) The leadership survey was based on Western cultural perspectives. Thus, when items were translated into the Korean language, care was needed to find appropriate Korean words to convey the western meaning.
3) A third limitation was the nature of survey research. Subjects were randomly sampled and the return rate was 69.5%. But we did not sample non-respondents to determine the likelihood our data were representative.
4) This study used a cross-sectional analysis that collected data at one point in time. It is possible that events external to our study might result in different results were the same design followed at a different point in time.
5) There is no formal performance evaluation for teachers or administrators in Korea. Items in our instrument that required self-analysis about job performance may have been viewed as intrusive and compromised face validity. We do not know if these subjects responded to items with complete objectivity in making judgements about their personal performance.

Methodology

A mailed survey using two instruments was used to collect data from 292 subjects. These subjects were identified from a population of 4,684 school principals in South Korea. The names of these individuals were obtained from the national department of education. From this population 420 subjects were randomly chosen and mailed instruments on March 13, 1999. From this mailing 292 principals returned usable surveys.

The following tables contain descriptive information about the school population in Korea.

Table 1: Secondary Schools in South Korea

Contents	Middle	High
Public	2,057	1,014
Private	684	929
Total	2,741	1,943

Adapted from 'The number of schools and teachers in South Korea' by Ministry of Education, 1999, Education Square 21 (8), 131.

In 1999, there were 2,741 middle schools and 1,943 high schools in South Korea (Ministry of Education, 1999). Of all 4,684 principals, 420 Korean principals were selected for this study. Individual principals were selected by random sampling. Each principal in the sample had an equal probability of being selected. Table 2 describes the type of schools participated in this study and Table 3 provides data about the size of the schools from which respondents came.

Table 2: Administrative Level of Participants

Contents	Frequency	Percent (%)
Middle	149	52.1
High	137	47.9
Total	286	100.0

Table 3: School Size in South

Contents	Mean	Min.	Max.	d.f.
Number of Teachers	43.54	8	158	286
Number of Students	958.70	53	3100	285

The average secondary school principal who participated in this study came from a school with an average of 44 teachers and 959 students. However, there was a wide distribution in size from small schools (8 teachers and 53 students) to huge schools (158 teachers and 3,100 students).

Table 4 describes the gender of Korean principals who participated in this study.

Table 4: Gender of Korean

Gender	Frequency	Percent (%)
Male	268	94
Female	17	6
Total	285	100

In this study, male principals constituted 94% of the respondents and female principals only 6%. This is characteristic of educational administrators in Korea.

Table 5 describes the age of Korean principals who participated in this study.

Table 5: Age of Korean Principals

Age	Frequency	Percent
30 – 39	1	0.4
40 – 49	4	1.3
50 – 59	76	27.0
More 60	201	71.3
Total	282	100.0

These data were of particular interest. Ninety eight percent of the principals in our sample were over 50. We found this preponderance of older educators in leadership

roles to be a manifestation of a cultural value that attributes leadership ability to older and wiser individuals.

The following process was used in developing instrumentation for the study. A 29 item survey measuring autocratic and democratic leadership values was created from three existing instruments with a research history of exploring autocratic and participatory leadership styles: 1) the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (1990); 2) the Authoritarian Questionnaire developed by Sanford (1950); and 3) the F Scale developed by Adorno, Frenkel, Levinson, and Sanford (1950). The items that we used are presented in Table 8-11 and the instrument is reported in the Appendix. Respondents were asked to respond to a Likert Scale using seven anchors ranging from Not Important to Extremely Important. As part of the development of this instrument on leadership, the version translated into Korean was piloted with a small population of Korean educators; the English version was reviewed by American educators for clarity and content. The instrument was not subjected to a full validation process.

The other questionnaire measured Confucian values and also contained 29 items using a Likert Scale with seven anchors. This instrument was piloted in the version translated into Korean with a group of Korean educators. The items that loaded into this administration of this instrument are reported in Tables 6-7. The instrument itself is reported the Appendix.

Results and Data Analysis

In this section we report on the descriptive results obtained from the surveys and the relationship of the results obtained by correlating data from the Chinese Value Survey with the autocratic and democratic sub-scales of the leadership instrument.

The Chinese Value Survey (CVS) was designed to tap cultural differences in East Asian countries and the rest of the world. The CVS was developed solely as a measure of the basic values held by Chinese. Thus, the survey was written in Chinese using Chinese concepts. It was therefore appropriate to determine how the instrument performed when translated into Korean.

A factor analysis was conducted on the 40 standardized means, with orthogonal rotation. Table 6 describes the 29 factors that loaded into the instrument. Two factors were deleted.

Table 6: CVS Factors
(Alpha = .92)

Item #	Item	Item to total correlation	Factor loading
CVS05	Loyalty to superior	.39	.83
CVS18	Patience	.55	.79
CVS22	Having a sense of shame	.53	.79
CVS01	Filial Piety	.33	.78
CVS17	Persistence	.59	.77
CVS11	Ordering relationship by status	.50	.74
CVS03	Tolerance of others	.47	.72
CVS04	Harmony with others	.52	.72
CVS13	Noncompetitiveness	.57	.72
CVS14	Patriotism	.53	.69
CVS08	Knowledge	.46	.69
CVS07	Kindness (forgiveness, compassion)	.62	.67
CVS19	Adaptability	.58	.65
CVS12	Sense of righteousness	.57	.64
CVS29	Respect for tradition	.56	.63
CVS02	Industry, working hard	.34	.61
CVS28	Having few desires	.64	.59
CVS15	Sincerity	.59	.58
CVS24	Contentedness with one's position in life	.60	.56
CVS06	Reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts	.47	.55
CVS10	Moderation, following the middle way	.59	.53
CVS09	Solidarity with others	.63	.50
CVS26	A close, intimate friend	.62	.47
CVS25	Protecting your 'face'	.47	.46
CVS27	Chastity of women	.57	.45
CVS23	Courtesy	.52	.40
CVS21	Trustworthiness	.50	.39
CVS20*	Prudence	.15	.55
CVS16*	Thrift	-.00	-.78

* deleted items

Factor analysis indicated that all but two items loaded into the CVS scale. The Cronbach's alpha of this instrument was .92, an acceptably high statistic. We have not attempted to analyze the cultural meaning that is attached to some of these items but believe in some instances individual items need substantial analysis. What, for example, does the English phrase, "having few desires" mean to the Korean respondent?

Table 7 describes the mean and standard deviation of CVS scales for this study.

Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations for CVS Scale
(Alpha = .92)

Item #	Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
CVS02	Industry, working hard	6.79	.42	273
CVS01	Filial Piety	6.76	.45	273
CVS21	Trustworthiness	6.74	.53	273
CVS04	Harmony with others	6.51	.62	273
CVS15	Sincerity	6.51	.66	273
CVS23	Courtesy	6.50	.66	273
CVS24	Contentedness with one's position in life	6.43	.69	273
CVS14	Patriotism	6.43	.70	273
CVS09	Solidarity with others	6.37	.71	273
CVS18	Patience	6.32	.72	273
CVS12	Sense of righteousness	6.29	.76	273
CVS17	Persistence	6.28	.72	273
CVS03	Tolerance of others	6.27	.64	273
CVS28	Having few desires	6.11	.75	273
CVS06	Reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts	6.10	.76	273
CVS19	Adaptability	6.06	.73	273
CVS07	Kindness (forgiveness, compassion)	6.07	.74	273
CVS27	Chastity of women	6.04	.81	273
CVS13	Non-competitiveness	6.04	.74	273
CVS26	A close, intimate friend	6.02	.75	273
CVS11	Ordering relationship by status	5.94	.76	273
CVS10	Moderation, following the middle way	5.93	.81	273
CVS08	Knowledge	5.89	.88	273
CVS29	Respect for tradition	5.80	.84	273
CVS22	Having a sense of shame	5.75	.97	273
CVS05	Loyalty to superior	5.57	.88	273
CVS25	Protecting your 'face'	5.31	1.01	273
CVS20*	Prudence	6.11	.75	273
CVS16*	Thrift	6.42	2.98	273

* deleted items

Korean principals scored an average of 6.18 on all the items on the Confucian Value Scale (the CVS was based on the 7-point scale: 1-the lowest Confucian Value, 7-the highest Confucian value). The standard deviation about that CVS average of 6.18 was .42. It was clear that within this group of Korean educators, there was a strong perception that Confucian values were important.

Interestingly, some of the attributions made of eastern culture by multi-cultural experts failed to be supported by these respondents. For example, it is common to believe that "saving face" is an important part of eastern cultures. While this particular item did load into the scale and did receive a score above the mean value, it had the lowest score of

any of the retained factors on the instrument. Note also that prudence and thrift, both commonly understood as values supported in eastern cultures, were deleted as a consequence of this factor analysis.

The other leadership instrument we used was subject to a parallel analysis. The factors that were used to measure autocratic and democratic dimensions of leadership are presented below. Tables 8 and 9 present factor analyses and central measures for the autocratic items we used; Tables 10 and 11 present similar data for our measures of democratic leadership values.

Table 8: Authoritative Leadership Factors

(Alpha = .62)

Item #	Item	Item to total correlation	Factor loading
LS12 (A scale)	The most important thing a child should learn is obedience to his parents	.31	.60
LS01 (F Scale)	It is essential for learning or effective work that our teacher outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it	.43	.58
LS16 (A scale)	The best leader is one who tells you what he expects or wants	.37	.53
LS07 (F scale)	What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country	.36	.52
LS20 (A scale)	The best leader is one who tells you clearly what to do	.37	.48
LS04 (F scale)	Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn	.26	.45
LS28 (MLQ)	I assign teachers to particular tasks	.35	.42
LS8* (A Scale)	Followers who disagree with the leader should keep quiet, follow anyway	.20	.48

* Deleted item

The alpha statistic (.62) of authoritative leadership scale was somewhat low, but remaining items were kept because the Authoritarian scale reflects one of leadership styles and one of the study objectives was to compare multiple measures of leadership styles. Table 9 describes the item mean and standard deviation of authoritative leadership scales for this study.

Table 9: The Authoritative Leadership Style Items

Item #	Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
LS07 (F scale)	What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country	6.20	1.05	284
LS20 (A scale)	The best leader is one who tells you clearly what to do	6.11	1.10	284
LS01 (F scale)	It is essential for learning or effective work that our teachers outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it	5.97	1.16	284
LS28 (MLQ)	I assign teachers to particular tasks	5.72	1.11	284
LS12 (A scale)	The most important thing a child should learn is obedience to his parents	5.27	1.39	284
LS04 (F scale)	Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn	4.74	1.71	284
LS16 (A scale)	The best leader is one who tells you what he expects or wants	4.57	1.85	284

From the descriptive analysis, it was found that Korean principals showed a mean value of 5.51on the authoritative leadership Scale. The standard deviation about that mean on the authoritative leadership scale was .76.

Tables 10 and 11 provide examples of how we operationalized concepts of democratic leadership. An examination of the item correlations indicates that these items do not perform as well as do the items on the Chinese Value Scale. Sufficient factors loaded into the scale to permit its use.

Table 10: The Democratic Leadership Style Items
(Alpha = .77)

Item #	Item	Item total correlation	Factor loading
LS23 (MLQ)	Permits the teachers to use their own judgement in solving problems	.57	.72
LS29 (MLQ)	Lets the teachers do their work the way they think best	.57	.72
LS27 (MLQ)	Put suggestions made by the group into operation	.54	.70
LS26 (MLQ)	I am arguing persuasively for teachers' point of view	.58	.66
LS25 (A scale)	Followers who disagree with the leader should speak up, work for good of the group, talk it over	.51	.63
LS22 (MLQ)	I wait patiently for the results of a decision	.40	.54
LS09 (A scale)	Followers who disagree with the leader should talk the points of disagreement	.39	.49
LS13 (A scale)	In a small neighborhood group, a leader should be community conscious	.34	.38
LS02* (A scale)	A leader who wants to be well liked must have the interest of the people at heart	.22	.62
LS05* (A scale)	The leader who pays a lot of attention to what his followers say is generally a better leader than one who doesn't	.22	.27
LS18* (A scale)	If there were a great emergency right around here people would need a leader who does things for followers	.18	.24

*Deleted items

Three items on the democratic leadership scale were removed. The alpha for this portion of the leadership questionnaire was .77.

Table 11 presents the mean and standard deviation of democratic leadership scales for this study.

Table 11: The Democratic Leadership Style Items

Item #	Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
LS29 (MLQ)	Lets the teachers do their work the way they think best.	6.27	.73	286
LS27 (MLQ)	Put suggestions made by the group into operation	6.21	.70	286
LS26 (MLQ)	I am arguing persuasively for teachers' point of view.	6.21	.86	286
LS13 (A scale)	In a small neighborhood group, a leader should be community conscious.	6.13	.90	286
LS09 (A scale)	Followers who disagree with the leader should talk the points of disagreement.	6.02	.99	286
LS25 (A scale)	Followers who disagree with the leader should speak up, work for good of the group, talk it over.	5.98	1.03	286
LS23 (MLQ)	Permits the teachers to use their own judgment in solving problems.	5.80	.88	286
LS22 (MLQ)	I wait patiently for the results of a decision	5.64	1.18	286

Table 12 summarizes the results from the administration of the three instruments. As one might expect, the culture of Korean school administrators seems most strongly expressed in responses to the CVS instrument. A higher mean, a lower standard deviation, and a stronger alpha occurred with this instrument.

We expected to find that authoritarian leadership values would be stronger than democratic values. Yet our findings indicate that little difference between these two leadership concepts.

Table 12: Descriptive Sample Statistics and Scale Reliability

Construct	Source of Scale Items	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number of Items	Cases	Alpha
Confucian Culture	The Chinese Culture Connection (1987)	6.18	.42	29	273	.92
Leadership Style	Authoritative Leadership (Adorno et al. 1950; Bass and Avolio, 1990	5.51	.76	7	284	.62
	Democratic Leadership Bass and Avolio, 1990)	6.03	.57	8	287	.77

With a mean of 6.03, the measure of democratic leadership styles exceeds the authoritarian measure (5.51). These two results appear to be contradictory. From the western tradition of leadership research, the two leadership styles form opposing conceptual frameworks. If the autocratic and democratic leadership constructs have content validity, the instruments should discriminate between the two. In our study, the two measures failed to do this. Table 13 shows correlations between the three measures.

Table 13: Correlation among Instruments

	1	2	3
1. Confucianism	1.00		
2. Authoritative Leadership	.44**	1.00	
3. Democratic Leadership	.45**	.45**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

These correlations reinforce the observations made above that in this respondent pool the traditional distinctions drawn in western studies of leadership do not appear. Both authoritative and democratic leadership values are associated with Confucianism and with each other.

There are many explanations for these findings. First, the translation of the leadership style instruments into Korean language may have compromised the meaning of the original items of these western oriented instruments. A copy of the Korean version of the instruments we used is included in the Appendix. Second, cultural factors indigenous to Korea may be such that distinctions between authoritative and democratic leadership are not widely observed. Indeed, given the items on the CVS, this is quite

probable. Eastern cultures appear to accept a leader's authority and the leader appears to accept a wide responsibility for followers. In this respondent pool, there appeared to be a number of leadership values that crossed the boundaries established for the competing leadership approaches common in western leadership research.

Implication

Confucian values appear significantly in the perceptions of how Korean administrators understand their work. This conclusion can be reached simply from the descriptive statistics presented above. Confucian values can also be seen in the nature of the respondent pool of administrations. These administrators are much older than would be a comparable pool in Great Britain or the United States. Feasance to elders is an obligation. Proper human relationship means sustaining the social structures that govern the relationships of individuals to each other. Hence, a leader may be both "the boss" and a "friend to the worker." In Korean society social stability is based upon unequal relationships. Hence, leadership lacks the tension so common in the United States between the superior and the subordinate roles. The Korean administrative culture retains traditional values and efforts to transform this culture into a westernized version should be crafted with an understanding of this reality.

Future Research

Issues of translation and interpretation appear to be most problematic in this study. How Korean principals understood such concepts as "decision-making" and "the clear giving of orders" as well as many of the other concepts on our Western leadership questionnaire needs further elaboration. We also think that it would be of value to learn more about how Korean principals interpreted the items on the Chinese Value Scale. As scholars in many disciplines are discovering, culture is the lens through which we view all matters. This study provides but a superficial look at how Korean principals view a subject as complex as leadership.

References:

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper and Brotl..rs.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1990). Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior. New York: Harper.

Bond, M.H. & Hwang, K.K. (1985). The social psychology of Chinese people. In Michael Bond (ed) The psychology of the Chinese people. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryant, M. (1998). Cross-cultural understandings of leadership. Educational Management and Administration. 26(1), pps7-20.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Demming, W. E. (1986). Drastic changes for western management. Madison, WI: Center for Quality and Productivity Improvement.

Greenfield, T.B. (1968). Research on the behavior of educational leaders: Critique of a tradition. Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 14, 55-76.

Halpin, A.W. & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R..M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds) Leader Behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Hofstede, G. (1991). Culture and organizations: Software of the mind. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Inkles, A. (1986). 'The Modernization of man'. In M. Weiner (ed.) Modernization. New York: Basic Books.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw Hill.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mead, M. (1930). Growing up in New Guinea: A comparative study of primitive education. New York: Morrow.

Mead, M. (1935). Sex and temperament in three primitive societies. New York: Morrow.

Ministry of Education. (1997). Statistical yearbook of education, 1996. Seoul, Korea.

Ministry of Education. (1998). Statistical yearbook of education, 1997. Seoul, Korea.

Sanford, F.H. (1950). Authoritarianism and leadership: A study of the follower's orientation to authority. Philadelphia, Institute for Research in Human Relations

Senge, Peter. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T.J,. Metzeus, R.H, & Burden, L. (1969). Toward a particularistic approach to leadership style. American Educational Research Journal, 6,62-80.

Shartle, C.L. & Stogdill, R.M. (1953). Studies in naval leadership: Metehods, results, and applications. (Technical Report). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Wheatley, M. (1994). Leadership and the new science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

White, R.K. & Lippitt, R. (1960). Autocracy and democracy: An experimental inquiry. New York: Harper.

APPENDIX A

Personal Data

Please provide the following information about yourself.

1.	Gender:	Male	Female					
2.	Age:	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-		
3.	Marital status:					Married		Unmarried
4.	Degrees of formal school education	B.A.		M.A.		Ed.D	Ph.D.	completed:
5.	Years of teaching experience:	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	over 30-
6.	Experience as a principal:	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	over 30-
7.	Type of school:	Public				Private		
8.	Clasification of school:	1-6 grade			7-9 grade		10-12 grade	
9.	Location of school:	Rural		Town		City		
10.	Size of school: (Number of teachers)	1-29		30-59		60-89	90-119	120-

QUESTIONNAIRE BTHE CHINESE VALUE SURVEY (ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

The items below are fundamental and basic values in life. Please indicate how important each of these concepts is to you personally. There are no right and wrong answers. Simply respond with your reaction for each item.

Not Important At all	Moderately Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Extremely Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.	Filial piety (obedience to parents, honoring of ancestors,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.	Industry (working hard)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.	Tolerance of others	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.	Harmony with others	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.	Loyalty to superior	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.	Reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.	Kindness (forgiveness, compassion)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8.	Knowledge (education)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9.	Solidarity with others	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10.	Moderation, following the middle way	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11.	Ordering relationships by status and observing order	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12.	Sense of righteousness	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13.	Non-competitiveness	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14.	Patriotism	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15.	Sincerity	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16.	Thrift	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17.	Persistence (Perseverance)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18.	Patience	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19.	Adaptability	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20.	Prudence (Carefulness)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21.	Trustworthiness	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22.	Having a sense of shame	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23.	Courtesy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24.	Contentedness with one's position in life	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25.	Protecting your "face"	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26.	A close, intimate friend	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27.	Chastity of women	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28.	Having few desires	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29.	Respect for tradition	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Adapted from 'Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture' by the Chinese Culture Connection, 1987, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18. 147.

QUESTIONNAIRE C

Leadership Style Survey

On the following questions is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may be appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description if leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can the your behavior.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.	It is essential for learning or effective work that our teacher outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.	A leader who wants to be well liked must have the interest of the people at heart	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.	I avoid telling them how to perform their jobs	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.	Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.	The leader who pays a lot of attention to what his followers say is generally a better leader than one who doesn't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.	I steer away from showing concern about results	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.	What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8.	Followers who disagree with the leader should keep quiet, follow anyway	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9.	Followers who disagree with the leader should talk the points of disagreement	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10.	Sometimes I avoid making decisions	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11.	I avoid getting involved in their work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12.	The most important thing a child should learn is obedience to his parents	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13.	In a small neighborhood group, a leader should be community conscious	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14.	If teachers don't contact me, I don't contact them	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15.	My presence has little effect on teachers' performance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16.	The best leader is one who tells you what he expects or wants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17.	I am likely to be absent when teachers needed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18.	If there were a great emergency right around here people would need a leader who does things for followers	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19.	I am hard to find when a problem arises	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20.	The best leader is one who tells you clearly what to do	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21.	I make teachers feel that whatever they do is okay with me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22.	I wait patiently for the results of a decision	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23.	Permits the teachers to use their own judgement in solving problems	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24.	I don't tell teachers where I stand on issues	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25.	Followers who disagree with the leader should speak up, work for good of the group, talk it over	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26.	I am arguing persuasively for teachers' point of view	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27.	Put suggestions made by the group into operation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28.	I assign teachers to particular tasks	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29.	Lets the teachers do their work the way they think best	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Adapted from Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire by Bernard, M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio, 1990, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. Authoritarian Questionnaire by Sanford, F. H., 1950, Institute for Research in Human Relations. F Scale by Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J. & Sanford, R. N., 1950, Harper and Brothers.

아래의 질문들은 우리가 살아가는데 있어서 여러 가치들에 대한 기본적인 가치관입니다. 이 질문들은 각 가치에 대한 당신의 의견을 제시하는 것이지 옳고 그른 대답이 없습니다. 각각의 항목을 주의 깊게 읽으신 후 각 항목에 대한 중요도를 해당란에 V 표시해 주시기를 바랍니다.

조금도 중요하지 않다	별로 중요하지 않다	보통이다	중요하다	매우 중요하다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	조금도 중요하지 않다		보통이다			매우 중요하다
1. 효도 (孝道)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. 근면 (勤勉)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. 타인에 대한 관용 (寬容)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. 타인과의 인화 (人和)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. 상사에 대한 충실도 (忠誠度)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. 타인에 대한 인사 (人事)표시	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. 仁愛 (인정을 베풂)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. 학식 (學識)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. 협동 (協同)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. 중용의 도 (中庸의 道)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. 상하간의 위계질서 (位階秩序)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. 정의감 (正義感)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. 신의 (信義)의 성실 (誠實)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. 애국심 (愛國心)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. 청렴결백 (淸廉潔白)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. 검소 (儉素)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. 끈기 (忍耐)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. 극기 (克己)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. 환경에의 적응력 (適應力)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

조금도 중요하지 않다	어느 정도 중요하지 않다	별로 중요하지 않다	잘 모르겠다	조금 중요하다	어느정도 중요하다	매우 중요하다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

	조금도 중요하지 않다			잘모르겠다			매우 중요하다
20. 신중 (愼重)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
21. 신용 (信用)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
22. 수치심 (羞恥心)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
23. 예절 (禮節)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
24. 사귀 분수 (分手)를 알고 지킴	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
25. 체면 (體面)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
26. 우정 (友情)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
27. 어지에게 있어서의 성숙 (眞摯)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
28. 과욕의 절제 (節制)	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
29. 전통 (傳統)의 존중	□	□	□	□	□	□	□

아래의 질문들은 교장의 지도력에 관해 여러분의 의견을 묻는 항목들입니다. 각각의 질문들은 일정한 종류의 행위를 제시하고 있지만 이는 행위가 바람직한 지 아닌지를 판단하기 위한 것이 아니며 여러분의 능력을 테스트하기 위한 것도 아닙니다.

각각의 항목을 주의 깊게 읽은 후, 이 질문에 의해 묘사된 행위에 여러분께서 가장 가까운 것이 어느 것인지 생각해 보시기 바랍니다. 그리고 7개의 항목 중에서 가장 옳다고 생각되는 항목의 옆란에 V 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다	어느정도 동의하지 않는다	별로 동의하지 않는다	잘 모르겠다	조금 동의한다	어느정도 동의한다	매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

1. 교사는 기본적으로 학습이나 효과적인 일 처리를 위해 학생들에게 무엇을 해야할 지 어떻게 해야하는 지에 대하여 세부적인 지침을 내려야 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

2. 교사들의 호감을 얻으려면 교장은 교사들의 이익을 진심으로 대변해야 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

조금도 동의하지 않는다	어느정도 동의하지 않는다	별로 동의하지 않는다	잘 모르겠다	조금 동의한다	어느정도 동의한다	매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

3. 나는 교사들에게 그들의 일을 처리하는 방법에 대해 말하기를 피한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

4. 권위에 대한 복종과 존경은 청소년들이 배워야 할 가장 중요한 미덕이다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

5. 일반적으로 교사들의 요청에 관심을 기울이는 교장이 그렇지 않은 교장보다 더 나은 지도력을 발휘할 수 있다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

6. 나는 일이 처리된 후, 그 결과들에 대한 관심을 나타내기를 피한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

7. 청소년들에게 가장 필요한 것은 엄격한 자기절제와 분명한 판단력, 자기의 일에 대한 의지력이다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

8. 교장과 의견이 틀린 교사들은 불만이 있더라도 그 지시에 따라야만 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

9. 교장의 의견에 동의하지 않는 교사들은 의견이 잘 일치되는 부분들을 교장에게 분명히 얘기해야 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

10. 때때로 나는 의사결정을 회피해 버린다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

11. 나는 교사들이 그들의 일을 할 때 간섭하기를 피한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

12. 청소년들이 배워야 할 가장 중요한 것은 복도에 대한 존중이다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

조금도 동의하지 않는다	아느정도 동의하지 않는다	약소 동의하지 않는다	잘 모르겠다	소금 동의한다	아느정도 동의한다	매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. 친숙한 소규모의 모임에서는 교장은 공통의 관심사에 귀를 기울여야만 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

14. 교사들이 나에게 찾아오지 않을 때는 나도 그들을 찾지 않는다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

15. 내가 있고 없고는 교사들의 일 처리에 별 영향력을 끼치지 않는다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

16. 우수한 교장은 교사에게 무엇을 해야 할 것인지를 구체적으로 말하는 사람이다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

17. 나는 교사들이 필요로 할 때 부재중인 경우가 많다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

18. 만일 지금 비상사태가 일어난다면, 교사들에게는 그들의 의견을 듣고 교사들의 입장에서 일을 처리하는 교장을 원할 것이다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

19. 학교 내에 문제가 발생했을 때 교사들이 나를 찾기가 힘이 든다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

20. 우수한 교장은 교사들에게 그가 무엇을 기대하는 지 또는 무엇을 원하고 있는지를 확실히 전달할 수 있어야 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

21. 나는 교사들로 하여금 그들이 무슨 행동을 하는 간에 그 행동이 문제가 되지 않을 것이라고 느끼게 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

22. 나는 어떠한 결정에 대해 그 결과가 나타날 때까지 침울성있게 기다린다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

조금도 동의하지 않는다	어느정도 동의하지 않는다	별로 동의하지 않는다	잘 모르겠다	조금 동의한다	어느정도 동의한다	매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

23. 나는 교사로 하여금 그들의 문제해결에 있어서 그들 자신의 판단을 허용한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

24. 나는 교사들에게 특정 문제에 대한 나의 입장을 밝히지 않는다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

25. 교장과 의견이 일치하지 않는 교사들은 교장에게 그들의 의견을 제시하고 학교를 위한 최선책을 상구하며 거듭 그 문제를 이야기해야 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

26. 나는 교사들과 그들이 가진 관점에 대해서 진지하게 토론한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

27. 교사들에 의해 제시된 제안들은 가급적이면 실행하려고 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

28. 나는 집합한 결정을 내리며, 그 일정을 교사들에게 구체적인 과업으로 할당한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□

29. 교사들이 일 처리를 할 때 그들로 하여금 최선이라고 생각하는 방법을 택하게 한다.

조금도 동의하지 않는다			잘 모르겠다			매우 동의한다
□	□	□	□	□	□	□